



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,199	11/12/2003	David J.P. Baar	198821-388249	2923
27155 7590 07/24/2008 McCarthy Tetraault LLP Box 48 Suite #4700 Toronto Dominion Bank Tower TORONTO, ON M5K 1E6 CANADA				
EXAMINER DEBNATH, SUMAN				
ART UNIT 2135		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 07/24/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/705,199

Applicant(s)

BAAR, DAVID J.P.

Examiner

SUMAN DEBNATH

Art Unit

2135

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 and 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pebley et al. (Patent No.: 6,154,840) (hereinafter "Pebley") and further in view of Carpendale et al. ("Carpendale", A Framework for Unifying Presentation Space).

4. As to claim 1, A method for controlling access to secured information for a predetermined region of a computer generated original image presented on a display, comprising:

Pebley discloses determining whether a user is authorized to access said secured information (col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62); and, in response to said determining, provide said user with said secured information on said display (col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62).

Pebley doesn't explicitly disclose distorting said original image to produce a distorted region for said predetermined region. However, Carpendale discloses

distorting said original image to produce a distorted region for said predetermined region (page 68, see also page 65-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley as taught by Carpendale in order to provide an user interface that "represent vast amounts of information on relatively small screens (Carpendale, abstract, lines 9-12)".

5. As to claim 20, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 1.

6. As to claim 2, Pebley discloses further comprising, in response to said determining, uncovering said distorted region (col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62).

7. As to claim 7, Pebley discloses further comprising receiving a signal from said user to select said predetermined region (col. 5, lines 26-32).

8. As to claim 8, Pebley doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said signal is generated by moving a cursor on said display with a pointing device. However, Carpendale discloses wherein said signal is generated by moving a cursor on said display with a pointing device (page 65, col. 2, lines 8-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley as taught by Carpendale in order to provide an user interface that

"represent vast amounts of information on relatively small screens (Carpendale, abstract, lines 9-12)".

9. As to claim 9, Pebley doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said pointing device is a mouse. However, Carpendale discloses wherein said pointing device is a mouse (page 65, col. 2, lines 8-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley as taught by Carpendale in order to provide an user interface that "represent vast amounts of information on relatively small screens (Carpendale, abstract, lines 9-12)".

10. As to claim 10, Pebley discloses wherein said secured information is detailed information (col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62).

As to claim 11, Pebley doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said detailed information is a magnified image. However, Carpendale discloses wherein said detailed information is a magnified image (page 65, col. 2, lines 8-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley as taught by Carpendale in order to provide an user interface that "represent vast amounts of information on relatively small screens (Carpendale, abstract, lines 9-12)".

11. As to claim 12, Pebley discloses wherein said secured information is encrypted information (col. 2, lines 50-62).

12. As to claim 13, Pebley discloses wherein said distorting further comprises decrypting said encrypted information (col. 2, lines 50-62).

13. As to claim 14, Pebley discloses wherein said original image includes at least one of a graphic image, a photographic image, and a text image (col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62).

14. As to claim 15, Pebley doesn't explicitly discloses wherein said distorting further includes applying a distortion function to said original image to produce said distorted region by displacing said original image onto said distortion function and projecting said displaced original image onto a plane. However, Carpendale discloses wherein said distorting further includes applying a distortion function to said original image to produce said distorted region by displacing said original image onto said distortion function and projecting said displaced original image onto a plane (page 68, see also page 65-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley as taught by Carpendale in order to provide an user interface that "represent vast amounts of information on relatively small screens (Carpendale, abstract, lines 9-12)".

15. As to claim 16, Pebley doesn't explicitly disclose wherein said applying further includes displaying a graphical user interface ("GUI") over said distorted region for receiving one or more signals for adjusting said distortion function. However, Carpendale discloses wherein said applying further includes displaying a graphical user interface ("GUI") over said distorted region for receiving one or more signals for adjusting said distortion function (page 68, see also page 65-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley as taught by Carpendale in order to provide an user interface that "represent vast amounts of information on relatively small screens (Carpendale, abstract, lines 9-12)".

16. As to claim 17, wherein said distortion function includes a focal region having a magnification for said predetermined region at least partially surrounded by a shoulder region where said magnification decreases to that of said original image to provide context for said predetermined region with respect to said original image, and said GUI is for adjusting at least one of:

Pebley doesn't explicitly disclose said magnification; a concavity of said shoulder region; an extent for said focal region; an extent for said shoulder region; a location for said distortion function within said original image; a location for an outline of said shoulder region within said original image; and, a location for said focal region relative to said shoulder region to define a degree and a direction of a folding of said distortion function. However, Carpendale discloses said magnification; a concavity of said

shoulder region; an extent for said focal region; an extent for said shoulder region; a location for said distortion function within said original image; a location for an outline of said shoulder region within said original image; and, a location for said focal region relative to said shoulder region to define a degree and a direction of a folding of said distortion function (page 68, see also page 65-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley as taught by Carpendale in order to provide an user interface that "represent vast amounts of information on relatively small screens (Carpendale, abstract, lines 9-12)".

17. Claims 1 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pebley and further in view of Robertson et al. (Patent No.: 5,670,984) (hereinafter "Robertson").

18. As to claim 1, A method for controlling access to secured information for a predetermined region of a computer generated original image presented on a display, comprising:

Pebley discloses determining whether a user is authorized to access said secured information (col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62); and, in response to said determining, provide said user with said secured information on said display (col. 5, lines 22-32, col. 2, lines 50-62).

Pebley doesn't explicitly disclose distorting said original image to produce a distorted region for said predetermined region. However, Robertson discloses distorting said original image to produce a distorted region for said predetermined region (col. 4, lines 29-37, col. 6, lines 34-50, col. 7, lines 30-41, col. 8, lines 14-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley as taught by Robertson in order to provide "a system that made quicker by generating and combining all the necessary transforms, and then rendering the objects of the full image through the combined transform (Robertson, column 4, lines 42-46)."

19. As to claim 20, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 1.

20. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pebley and further in view of Carpendale and Brew at al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0196114 A1) (hereinafter "Brew").

21. As to claim 3, neither Pebley nor Carpendale explicitly disclose wherein said determining further comprises receiving authentication information from said user and comparing said authentication information to stored authentication information for said user. However, Brew discloses wherein said determining further comprises receiving authentication information from said user and comparing said authentication information

to stored authentication information for said user (FIG. 10, [0085], lines 5-7 and lines 11-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley and Carpendale as taught by Brew in order to "control access to protected content (Brew, [0009])."

22. As to claim 4, neither Pebley nor Carpendale explicitly disclose wherein said authentication information includes at least one of a user identification number and a password. However, Brew discloses wherein said authentication information includes at least one of a user identification number and a password ([0085], lines 11-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley and Carpendale as taught by Brew in order to "control access to protected content (Brew, [0009])."

23. Claims 5-6 are 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pebley and further in view of Carpendale, Brew and Foley et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0087894 A1) (hereinafter "Foley").

24. As to claim 5, neither Pebley nor Carpendale and Brew explicitly disclose wherein said authentication information is received through a dialog box. However, Foley discloses wherein said authentication information is received through a dialog box ([0026], lines 5-7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley, Carpendale

and Brew as taught by Foley in order to provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

25. As to claim 6, neither Pebley nor Carpendale and Brew explicitly disclose wherein said dialog box is presented adjacent to said predetermined region. However, Foley discloses wherein said dialog box is presented adjacent to said predetermined region ([0026], lines 5-7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley, Carpendale and Brew as taught by Foley in order to provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

26. As to claim 18, neither Pebley nor Carpendale and Brew explicitly disclose wherein said authentication information is biometric information. However, Foley discloses wherein said authentication information is biometric information ([0026], lines 21-27). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley, Carpendale and Brew as taught by Foley in order to provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

27. As to claim 19, neither Pebley nor Carpendale and Brew explicitly disclose wherein said biometric information includes fingerprint, iris pattern, voice pattern, and DNA pattern information. However, Foley discloses wherein said biometric information

includes fingerprint, iris pattern, voice pattern, and DNA pattern information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teaching of Pebley, Carpendale and Brew as taught by Foley in order to provide a authentication system with "improved security and minimal overhead for users and merchants (Foley, [0009])".

28. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Response to Arguments

29. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground (s) of rejection is made. See rejection above.

Conclusion

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUMAN DEBNATH whose telephone number is (571)270-1256. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on 571 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2135

/H. S./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2135